DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 349 832 FL 020 651

AUTHOR Steffens, John E.
TITLE Will the LEP Train Reach Its Destination? Designing the IHE Teacher Training Program for Specific LEP Student Instructional Needs.
PUB DATE Aug 92
NOTE 38p.; In: Focus on Evaluation and Measurement. Volumes 1 and 2. Proceedings of the National Research Symposium on Limited English Proficient Student Issues (2nd, Washington, DC, September 4-6, 1991); see FL 020 630.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Change Strategies; Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Limited English Speaking; Program Design; Student Needs; *Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses designing an individual higher education (IHE) teacher training program that focuses on the instructional needs of limited-English-proficient students (LEP). The paper seeks to accomplish the following: excite individuals to want to participate in building a new paradigm in teacher training for teachers of all LEP students; provide background information and a preliminary knowledge base to substantiate a call for action; relate the need to pay attention to LEP students in educational reform and restructuring activities, particularly the AMERICA 2000 strategies; and describe some steps that need to be taken on how to accomplish the tasks outlined. Two responses to the paper, one by Virginia Collier and one by Rosita G. Galang, are appended. (VWL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Will the LEP Train Reach Its Destination?

Designing an IHE Teacher Training Program for Specific LEP Student Instructional Needs

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

John E. Steffens
University of Oklahoma, Norman

ED349832

As we Americans enter the last decade approaching the year 2000, the various agencies related to Education, Labor, Health, Human Services, etc. are challenged by the enormity of the tasks ahead to achieve equitable quality of life for all citizens of America. A concomitant general sense of commitment to accomplish these goals is being evidenced by citizenry and futuristic demographers alike. A host of recent publications emphasize a national commitment toward changing positively access and effect of societal programs to serve the whole of the American population.

This paper is intended to:

- Excite you to want to participate in building a new paradigm in teacher training for teachers of all LEP students;
- Provide background and a preliminary knowledge base to substantiate a call for action;
- Relate the need for paying attention to LEP students in educational reform and restructuring activities, particularly the AMERICA 2000 strategies; and,
- Describe some steps that need to be taken now to accomplish the tasks outlined.

Building A New Paradigm

A new way must be defined to look at what all teachers need to know and be able to do when LEP students are assigned to their classes. Operational programs set into place in all teacher training institutions should build upon what has been proved successful and demonstrated to work in teaching LEP students. Administrative strategies should provide total administrative and community support to assure the educational advancement and required services for LEP students.

The need to engage professorial and administrative education personnel nationwide in the dialogue to develop this new paradigm is

FL 020 651

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

crucial. The ability to bring together a common knowledge base for teaching LEP children is vitally necessary. The strategies for providing equal education opportunities for all LEP students, wherever they choose to attend school, is our national responsibility. By working together, we can identify what works in teaching and supporting LEP students. We can build this knowledge base into the teacher training curricula of the one thousand or more teacher training institutions of the nation. Every emerging teacher will then have a foundation of what to do when a LEP student is assigned to the classroom.

What should MATH teachers know about teaching math to LEP students?

What should GEOGRAPHY teachers know about teaching geography to LEP students?

What should HISTORY teachers know about teaching history to LEP students?

What should SCIENCE teachers know about teaching science to LEP students?

What should ENGLISH teachers know about teaching English to LEP students?

Education Secretary Lamar Alexander describes four trains (AMERICA 2000, p. 12) running on parallel tracks, each headed toward educational excellence! The four trains represent the four parts of the AMERICA 2000 strategy.

We would expect that each of the four trains should be in excellent mechanical condition to arrive at its destination by the year 2000. If a critical part of the train is defective, however, the whole train might be delayed. I suggest to you that each of the trains has a defective wheel that needs to be repaired. The defective wheel is supported by a defective undercarriage. The undercarriage supports a car full of LEP students. The defective undercarriage represents the teaching and education services for individual LEP students where no bilingual classes are offered. The defective wheel is the teacher training of all teachers who will have one or more LEP students in their classrooms. The car represents the education curriculum in each of the five core subjects to support individual LEP students. The passengers in the car are LEP students.

The train cannot arrive at its destination without its precious cargo. The expectations are that if the train does not arrive, the AMERICA 2000 strategy is a failure -- by its own definitions and standards! How to fix the defective wheel and undercarriage can be

found in quality sciences and voluntary standards, using a process to establish and use a new paradigm. Attitudinal shifts must occur, such as:

FROM	TO
• Add-on nuisance	• Essential to my job
• They don't count.	• I can't succeed if they don't.

From a world perspective, many in education were startled by findings reported by the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement. According to their reports:[1]

> ...Assessments of 20 school systems around the world rank American eighth graders 10th in arithmetic, 12th in algebra, and 16th in geometry. Even America's top students fare poorly in international comparisons: among the top 1 percent of high school seniors, American students ranked last.[2]
>
> Achievement in science is no better. Among 10-year-olds in 15 countries, Americans rank eighth. Among 14-year-olds in 17 countries, Americans tie with children in Singapore and Thailand for 14th place. Among advanced science students in 12 nations, Americans are 11th in chemistry, 9th in physics, and last in biology.[3]

These statistics are only a sample supporting the general conclusion that much must be accomplished to improve education if we are to meet the educational necessities for **all** Americans.

The changing demographics of the United States is apparent to even the casual observer. "Language minority children make up a growing proportion of U.S. youngsters. It is estimated that the number of such children aged birth to [four] years rose from 1.8 million in 1976 to 2.6 million in 1990 (Soto, 1991). The number of children with limited English proficiency is expected to continue to increase."[4]

Many of these children, from various ethnolinguistic backgrounds are identifiable as limited English proficient (LEP) students. These LEP students are not concentrated in any one location and in any one environment. A portion of these students reside where significant numbers of students are of similar ethnolinguistic backgrounds. Others reside in communities where significant numbers of LEP students come from a variety of different ethnolinguistic backgrounds. Another category of LEP students are those who reside in small groups scattered across this country, sparsely distributed in communities and schools so that sometimes only one, or on occasion a few or even several LEP students of different ethnolinguistic backgrounds might be found in the classrooms of this country.

The problem of providing adequate and equal service for these students is even more complex. The shortages in the supply of bilingual teachers to fill bilingual classrooms described in the first two scenarios of the previous paragraph have been documented in the literature. For those two categories, i.e., large groups of same language and large groups of different languages LEP students, the needs have been identified, must be met, and discussions and descriptions of appropriate teacher training programs to meet the needs have been developed. This has all received previous attention in both literature and program implementations, and certainly deserves continued consideration, both because of current need and also because of increasing demand and future growth projections.

This paper, however, will focus on that portion of LEP students fitting the description of residing in those communities where students with various non-English speaking ethnolinguistic backgrounds are sparsely distributed. As in other parts of the American culture, this specific LEP population is rapidly growing. The majority of classrooms in America have from one to several of such students in them. With 110,000 schools in this country, the specific LEP student population that has not been adequately served and needs to be served represents a significant number of children. Though not as visible because they are more sparsely distributed, the reality of cultural and education shock and/or adjustment/accommodation is just as significant -- and sometimes may be even more so -- for a LEP child in this less concentrated environment rather than the more highly concentrated LEP environment presently receiving the most study, attention, and services.

> In general, children whose first language, or whose families' first language, is not English score lower than their English-proficient peers on standardized reading and math tests.[5] By third grade, children whose families often or always speak a language other than English at home may be more than a year behind their peers in reading proficiency.[6]

If by the third grade, LEP children are one year or more behind their peers in reading proficiency, it follows that these students are very "high risk" students for dropping out of school in the future as well as high risk for a full assortment of other risk behaviors (pregnancy, alcohol/drug abuse, etc.)

Robert Milk[7] concisely summarizes recent literature and its application to the task before us in preparing teachers to appropriately meet the educational needs of LEP students. He suggests that:

> One clear theme that emerges from contemporary discussions on preparation of teachers for mainstream education is that programs need to achieve greater integration of theory and practice.

This [concept] is [supported] in the language teaching literature (Alatis, Stern and Strevens, 1983).[8]

Methods courses must stress the interrelationship of theory and practice. In addition, experiential activities must provide hands-on field experience for the effective preparation of a teacher (Mellgren, Walker and Lange, 1988; Celce-Murcia, 1983; McGroarty and Galvan, 1985; Clark and Milk, 1984).[9]

Milk cites that it is important to develop a research perspective in future teachers that will encourage them to be curious, to ask questions as to what is happening in the learning environment, to observe closely, and to develop a heightened awareness about what is occurring. He also refers to the need for a balanced amount of intuition.

Teachers must experience preparation which provides interrelated knowledge and experiences drawing from linguistics, psychology, sociology, and culture (Politzer, 1978:14). At many institutions this may represent a need to collaborate across the disciplines and/or departmental lines of education, foreign language, linguistics, English or even more (Milk, 1985). There is significant support for integrating the areas of bilingual education, ESL, and foreign language in the preparation of teachers. McKeon (1985) found a significant overlap in teacher education standards in these areas and also found common research themes across the three areas. Collier suggests that course work to prepare ESL and bilingual teachers is similar in many ways and "bilingual and ESL staff can benefit most from an integrated approach to training."[10]

Educational Reform and Restructuring

The focus of this paper is to address the need for the training of teachers who will have responsibility for teaching students from specific LEP populations sparsely scattered throughout American classrooms where numbers are not concentrated enough to support bilingual class structures and teachers as such. The scenario presented will describe how teacher training should take place to affect the educational experience across the multitude of school communities and classrooms in the United States. Positive education outcomes must be a reality for the LEP children who are distributed sparsely throughout the schools and classrooms of America. To do anything less is to fail.

The author of this paper asserts that such preparation of teachers must happen within the context of what is known to work in the areas of bilingual education, ESL, whole language learning, etc. involving collaborative contributions of linguistics, psychology, sociology, culture, organizational management, social work, and academic content.

If America is to achieve the "year 2000" goals in education -- health, employment, youth -- we, in this country, will be required to approach these areas in new and different ways. It will require that teacher trainers experience what has become known as a "paradigm shift." The teaching profession will be required to envision the entire education and social scenario in a new kind of way. Then, within this new envisioning, develop missions, goals, standards, objectives, strategic plans, curriculums, activities, and assessments. This process must include what we now know regarding bilingual/bicultural education, identify the areas where standards must be set and met, and engage in the dynamic process to ensure the accomplishment of the process and tasks.

Within the context of this paper, the author describes an approach which will contribute to the education of and "make a difference" in the lives of LEP children in classrooms where few, if any other LEP students, are present.

1. If the assumption is true that in the majority of classrooms in this country there are one or more LEP children and there are 110,000 schools, then the population of LEP children totals tens of thousands of students -- and the number is growing rapidly.

2. If the assumption is true that we cannot supply enough bilingual teachers even for existing bilingual classrooms, then we certainly have not been able to supply adequately prepared bilingual teachers for these classrooms with smaller numbers of LEP students, either.

3. If the assumption is true that we must develop the local educational environment to adequately serve LEP students throughout America so that the educational achievement of all LEP students is enhanced and not inhibited, then we must plan, design, and implement an education process for developing the programs whose foundations are rooted in the "known," but whose delivery is structured under a new paradigm.

As we contemplate what the response to this third assumption might be, some questions arise. What might such a new design for a teacher training paradigm look like? How could American education possibly meet such a challenge? To succeed we must rely on what is known and apply it in a new kind of way. We must utilize the contributions of education, management theory and practice, social change and social systems knowledge, and sociology and psychology to establish and use a new knowledge base for preparing teachers of LEP students.

One dimension of the new paradigm that must be addressed relates to sheer numbers of students. If most classrooms in America

either have or will have one or more LEP students, it follows that all teachers must be prepared to ensure that the learning environment and education practices enhance educational achievement for LEP students and ensure that no inhibition of education occurs.

For this to be accomplished, we cannot rely only on receiving the services of the various centers and in-service and preservice bilingual training programs that currently exist. These programs have been repeatedly proven useful and successful and the magnitude of need for these programs continues to grow as the LEP populations multiply. Therefore, another supplemental approach that holds promise is to focus on the foundation block of teacher training. There are approximately 1,000 colleges of education throughout the United States. Only a fraction of these have bilingual education preparation programs. If we are to change the paradigm of American education for these LEP children, we must implement a systemic approach which will facilitate change for all educators. We must consider both the organizational management dimensions as well as the content or input necessary to ensure the transformation toward a facilitative educational experience for LEP children. The results will most certainly assure an equitable educational outcome for LEP students.

First of all, let us address the managerial side. The majority of teachers in America are produced by the many regional teacher training institutions throughout the states of this country. The foundational structure for the changes necessary in the academic approaches and the content areas in these teacher training programs involve the development of a new paradigm for the content methodology and procedures related to the educational sequences in teacher preparation, educational leadership and administrative preparation programs. The paradigm shift for management of teacher education must include the comprehensive content, that is, the total outcome of the teacher training enterprises. Attention must be paid to what every teacher needs to know and be able to do in working with LEP students. Professors and the higher education community responsible for these training sequences must review, revise, and implement the necessary changes to ensure that all educators with whom they have contact become prepared to respond according to the new paradigm, and do so as it is being defined and established.

Regular classroom teachers working with one or more LEP students must be informed and practiced in the art and science of teaching LEP students. Thonis (1991) has identified characteristics that teachers who work with LEP students should possess.[11]

- an awareness of cultural differences
- a recognition of language diversity

- a knowledge of second language acquisition theory
- an understanding of the students' realities
- a sensitivity to the values of families
- a knowledge of the history and heritage of the group
- a recognition of strengths and potential of all students
- a willingness to modify and adapt instruction as needed
- a solid grasp of curriculum imperatives for students learning in a second language.

As we move toward the paradigm shift, we might ask ourselves how the shift could be accomplished. Managerially, this shift might be addressed by a series of summer institutes for IHE faculty and administrators designed to increase faculty knowledge and perception of necessary theory and practice involving LEP students. Upon acquisition of this input, faculty would revise methodology courses to include necessary content and practice. These faculty would then return to their institutions with a four-point charge:

1. Implement the curricular changes into the scope and sequence of teacher preparation at their IHE.
2. In-service their own faculty in these curricular changes.
3. In-service teachers in schools in the local service area regularly served by the local IHE.
4. Participate in an ongoing national dialogue to define the new paradigm and adjust as a national agreement emerges.

What should be included in this new program? What are some dimensions which must be addressed?

The U.S. Department of Education (USDE) guide for implementing the first national goal cites children from families where English is not spoken require schools and communities to develop new ways of educating children and securing the support of their families.[12] This report further suggests that the involvement of parents is critical to the development of young children and their educational success.[13] And that while proficiency in more than one language is a lifelong resource, children whose English proficiency is limited need special assistance as they prepare for school success.[14] And that developmentally appropriate, culturally sensitive programs should be available.

Decades of research on successful or effective schools identify several common characteristics. Effective schools have high expectations for students and teachers. They set rigorous academic standards, maintain order and discipline, require homework, and encourage parental support and cooperation.[15] They have strong leadership from a principal; a stable staff of competent and enthusiastic teachers; a curriculum that is integrated across grade levels and that accommodates the variety of learning styles and cultural backgrounds of their students; and opportunities for parents to participate in their children's education. Underlying all of these elements is a set of clear and broadly accepted educational goals -- a vision or mission to which all members of the school community are committed.[16]

Research on effective schools also stresses the importance of school climate -- the physical and social environment in which education takes place. At a minimum, school climate refers to physically safe and personally supportive schools and classrooms and mutual respect between students and educators.[17] More broadly, a positive school climate refers to classroom and learning environments that make it possible for students and teachers to work toward the common goals or shared educational mission of the school. It is also characterized by active involvement by parents and teachers in important school decisions.[18]

Numerous recent reports support the concept that education is a social phenomenon involving the whole community. However, in the past, schools have tended to regard themselves and be regarded by law and social policy as "isolated, disconnected segments of our social and economic lives."[19] Society has "put a disproportionate faith in the impact of schools working alone" to solve educational problems.[20] Yet, a review of the education literature suggests that educators, working alone, cannot possibly solve the multi-faceted and complex societal challenges. It is becoming increasingly recognized that "in order to effectively meet these challenges, the entire community must be involved: parents, schools, students, law enforcement authorities, religious groups, social service agencies, and the media. This broad-based approach -- one that has achieved successful results related to our nation's recent school improvement and educational excellence movements -- involves bringing all available human and material resources to bear on the situation at hand.[21]

The recent proliferation of educational activities throughout the United States is viewed as both an expression of public commitment to action and representative of a vast resource of talent, commitment, and ideas. Yet, it should be noted that:

> When educational institutions and agencies undertake collaborative efforts in education, an initial tendency is to enter into discussions about how one agency can help the other(s). The pre-

dominant notion is that individuals in one setting are more skilled, possess more accurate insights, are better equipped to bring about a desired improvement than those in the other settings. The less the collaborators have worked together in the past, the more this attitude appears to prevail in the minds of both the people in the schools and those in other agencies.

As a result, a work on rather than a work with posture underlies many joint efforts....[22]

The organizational development that a local community must undergo in responding to the current educational crisis and the wide variety of skills needed to plan and implement initiatives require maximum commitment and participation. Many school district personnel already possess much of the knowledge and many of the human resource skills needed to create and operationalize an effective plan. However, a new paradigm that incorporates the latest knowledge in school effectiveness has not been developed and accepted by many schools and teacher training institutions.

It is important to note that some school personnel are involved in the surrounding community activities and organizations. These "boundary spanners" have one foot in the school system and the other in the infrastructure of the surrounding community. As such, they are able to identify individuals, organizations, and social groups in the community.[23] From this pool of potential resources can be assembled individuals who will be invaluable in identifying and mobilizing other human and material resources in the community. Through their efforts, a collaborated vision of a new reality can emerge, a new paradigm for school effectiveness can become operational.

Educators have found that, by involving people right from the beginning, their communities are more likely to come together and work cooperatively with the schools in achieving the goals they have formulated together.[24] People who are involved from the start are committed to a shared vision of what a school should be, and work to make that vision reality.

Let us now address some of the general content areas that teacher trainers in university teacher education programs should provide as a framework for training public school teachers in the skills and knowledge that will prepare them to address the needs of multicultural student populations. Specifically, these areas provide the necessary information and resources to introduce multicultural education training into the teacher education curricula. These items should most appropriately be inserted into the teacher training curricula, rather than segmented onto it. Every American teacher should know about and be able to do certain activities to support the

schooling growth of LEP students. The preliminary list provided below was developed by Dr. Ravi Sheorey, assistant director of the Service Area Eight Bilingual Education Multifunctional Resource Center at the University of Oklahoma, from a variety of sources, to initiate thought and reflection.

1. Introduction

Major terms and concepts in multicultural education

Ethnolinguistic diversity and American public schools: A demographic profile and projection for the 1990s

Language diversity and public school education: The needs of limited English proficient (LEP) students

Educational equity, cultural pluralism, and multicultural education

The need for a multicultural education component in teacher education programs

11. An Historical Overview of Multicultural Education

Multicultural education in non-U.S. Western industrialized countries

Multicultural education in the U.S. in the 19th and 20th centuries

Multicultural education in the "global village": The case of the U.S.

111. Multicultural Education and Related Issues

Language policy in the United States: past and present

The relationship of language and culture

Teaching and learning native and second languages

Native language maintenance: help or hindrance to education?

The role of language and culture in cognitive development and selfconcept development

IV. Bilingual Schooling and Multicultural Education

The rationale for bilingual/multicultural education

Bilingual education programs in the United States: Federal laws and their implementation in schools

Recent trends in bilingual programs and practices

Major research findings about the effectiveness of bilingual education in American schools

V. Assessment Issues in Bilingual/Multicultural Education

Language proficiency, bilingualism, and academic development

Referral, assessment, and placement of language-minority students in public schools

The construct of language proficiency: communicative versus academic language proficiency

Developing "culture-fair" assessment procedures

Testing LEP students in English and the native language

Vl. Multicultural Education and Special Education

The construct of learning disability and the LEP student

The measurement of learning disabilities in multicultural education

Patterns of special education placement of culturally diverse students

Vll. Developing a Multicultural Curriculum in Teacher Education

The rationale for curricular adjustment in teacher education programs

Multiculturalism in the curricula related to the teaching of math and science, social studies and language arts

Introducing cross-cultural variables in teacher education courses

Infusing multiculturism in the field experiences of prospective teachers

VIII. Competencies for Prospective Teachers in Multicultural Education

Personality attributes

Affective skills

Pedagogical skills

Cross-cultural field experiences

IX. Teaching Strategies for Multicultural Education

Self-assessment of multicultural education skills

Values, perceptions, and assumptions in various ethnic groups

Cross-cultural communication: verbal and non-verbal

"Hands-on" training methodologies: Simulations, role-playing, critical incident/case study approaches, decision-making in a cross-cultural setting, etc.

X. Evaluation of Multicultural Education Component in Teacher Training

Entities to be evaluated: knowledge, perceptions, attitudes, skills, and patterns of behavior

Techniques of evaluation: paper and pencil exercises, critical incidents, self-analysis reports, etc.

Measurement of changes in attitudes and perception at the beginning and end of program

Effort is required to determine appropriate administrative principles and practices, to synthesize the components of a school into an effective organization and to meet these challenges. The effort for defining and achieving quality in the process is a continuing one.

Besides the increasing complexity of the teaching profession, it is also becoming increasingly more challenging to determine administrative principles and practices which effectively tie the behavioral variables of an organization into harmonious and productive units.

Guba indicates that the unique task of the administrator can be understood as that of mediating between the behavior eliciting forces of organization needs and individual needs so as to produce behavior which is organizationally useful as well as individually satisfying. Action leading to such behavior on the part of individual members is the highest expression of the administrator's art.[25] Likert reinforces this view by insisting that it is essential to recognize that the performance and output of any enterprise depends entirely upon the quality of the human organization and its capacity to function as a tightly knit, highly motivated, technically competent entity. High educational efforts are not accomplished by impersonal equipment and computers. These goals are achieved by human beings. Successful organizations are those making the best use of individuals to perform well and efficiently all the tasks required to accomplish the aims and objectives for which organizations exist.[26]

The theme of this paper imposes the goal of changing the organizational accomplishments -- as related to educational accomplishments of LEP students. Halpin suggests that changes in the organization's accomplishments are the best criteria of the administrator's effectiveness.[27] Culbertson added that the capacity to cope constructively with change is the important test of leadership.[28] Referring to such change Lonsdale suggests that organizations need flexibility to accommodate to disturbances and to initiate new structures or to revise the goals of the organization.[29]

Values as they relate to organizational phenomena contribute to the quality of outcomes and changes. Blau described the integrative bonds of an organization as:

> the common values and norms...and the network of social relations in which processes of social interaction become organized.[30]

Teachers, by the nature of their jobs, become educational administrators. Teachers, administrators, students and others are all part of the social organization of the educational "system" operating in any community.

Communities and schools must practice the art of inclusion. The education and social needs of the LEP students must be met by the organized community that supports the work of the schools. The school administrators and teaching staff must meet the needs of LEP students.

It is needful to review a couple of management styles to reflect on possible strategies to include LEP related issues into every school organization in America.

Likert asserts that primarily two systems of management with different emphases developed side by side. The "job organization"

system relies basically on the economic motives of buying a man's time and then telling him precisely what to do, how to do it, and at what level to produce. The "cooperative-motivation" system tends to use the principles and methods of scientific management and related management principles to a degree. This system taps not only the economic motives but additionally other strong motives, such as the ego motive.[31] He attempted to include the desirable features of each into an integrating principle of management which states that:

> The leadership and other processes of the organization must be such as to ensure a maximum probability that in all interactions and all relationships with the organization each member will, in light of his background, values, and expectations, view the experience as supportive and one which builds and maintains his sense of personal worth and importance.[32]

The basic principle of Likert's approach is that of "supportive relationships." He included four systems identified as: (1) exploitive authoritative; (2) benevolent authoritative; (3) consultative; and (4) participative.[33] He concluded that system four, "participative," is the most desirable, because as organizations move toward this system, the more productive and satisfying they become.

Several investigators, recognizing the relationship of values with human and interpersonal needs, have formulated classification schemes for these needs. Schutz's theory of interpersonal behavior proposes that each individual has three interpersonal needs: (1) inclusion, (2) control and (3) affection. His theory suggests:

> The term "interpersonal" refers to relations that occur between people as opposed to relations in which at least one participant is inanimate. It is assumed that, owing to the psychological presence of other people, interpersonal situations lead to a behavior in an individual that differs from the behavior of the individual when he is not in the presence of other persons.[34]

The interpersonal need of inclusion is behaviorally defined as the need to establish and maintain a satisfactory relation with people with respect to interaction and association. This is further defined as the need to establish and maintain a feeling of mutual interest with other people. This includes (1) being able to take an interest in other people to a satisfactory degree and (2) having other people interested in the self to a satisfactory degree. With regard to the self-concept, the need for inclusion is the need to feel that the self is significant and worthwhile.

The interpersonal need for control is behaviorally defined as the need to establish and maintain a satisfactory relation with people with respect to control and power. This is further defined as the

need to establish and maintain a feeling of mutual respect for the competence and responsibility of others. This includes (1) being able to respect others to a satisfactory degree and (2) having others respect the self to a satisfactory degree. With regard to the self-concept, the need for control is the need to feel that one is a competent, responsible person.

The interpersonal need for affection is behaviorally defined as the need to establish and maintain a satisfactory relation with others with respect to love and affection. At the feeling level the need for affection is defined as the need to establish and maintain a feeling of mutual affection with others. This feeling includes (1) being able to love other people to a satisfactory degree and (2) having others love the self to a satisfactory degree. With regard to the self-concept, the need for affection is the need to feel that the self is lovable.

Schutz developed his efforts from the work of personality theorists. Of significance to his efforts was the work of Horney, Fromm, and Freud. Each of these identified three types or areas of interpersonal needs. Although the terminology is not identical in the descriptions of these areas, the definitions are quite similar. Horney identifies these areas as (1) moving toward people, (2) moving against people, and (3) moving from people.[35] Fromm identifies the areas as (1) withdrawal destructiveness, (2) symbiotic, and (3) love.[36] Freud identifies the three major systems as (1) erotic, (2) obsessional, and (3) narcissistic.[37]

Argyris suggests a four-dimensional classification including (1) inner needs and outer needs; (2) conscious and unconscious needs; (3) social needs; and (4) physiological needs.[38] Maslow developed his hierarchy of needs including five categories. In ascending order these are: (1) physiological needs; (2) safety needs; (3) belongingness and love needs; (4) esteem needs; and (5) the need for self-actualization. A basic part of this theory is that other and higher needs emerge when lower needs are satisfied, but not until they are satisfied.[39] The contribution of values both to individual and organizational behavior is commonly accepted by these organizational theorists. Parsons suggests that values are internalized cultural standards, norms, and expectations that influence a person's behavior. While value systems are highly personal, they are also involved in and affect the organization to which one holds membership. Parsons states this as: "A personal value system is in the social context, the network of rights and obligations in which an individual's value-commitment involves him in his social situation."[40] This would suggest that within the social systems context the individual's value orientations influence his perception of organizational components.

Value orientations develop through many ways. Education and training are important components of developing individual and community value orientations, or ethic constructs.

A paradigm shift is a change of how a person views reality. Education has the power to change personal views of reality. Education can increase perceptual acuity of teachers and administrators in working with all students, and particularly with LEP students.

School administrators and teachers should be able to use the total resources that the education industry has available for making sure that every teacher of LEP children is prepared to provide appropriate instruction to that student's needs. Appropriate instruction makes it possible for a LEP student to advance academically to the expectations of the school and the community at large while learning English. Appropriate instruction must rely on the totality of the resources available within the community, and on the total quality support from the administration of the schools. Resources are obtainable and are usefully articulated into standard school practices through attention to acceptable principles of management and teaching. Newer management attitudes are developing with the use of the concepts of total quality management (TQM), the quality sciences and the voluntary development of missions and standards. The education industry lacks such devices to measure progress of the education enterprise toward accomplishing its missions, goals and community expectations. These tenets of newer management constructs are included in the proposed steps designed to accomplish the paradigm shift for providing a quality education for all LEP students in the United States.

Towards the New Paradigm

How can we, then, as professional educators, accomplish a paradigm shift in teacher training for teachers of all LEP students in the United States? We will need to:

1. **Identify and keep what is good (what works) that we have learned, nationally, in working with LEP students, whether in large groups, small groups, or individually.**

There is no one best way to help LEP students achieve quality schooling. We need, as a profession, to continually contribute what we have learned as individuals and collectively and in working with LEP students. We need to use all the resources at our disposal in doing this and stretch ourselves to make sure a solid, accessible knowledge base is organized and immediately available for all education personnel, the community at large and parents, particularly.

2. **Develop acceptable levels of knowledge about what works by subject area as outlined in AMERICA 2000, but specifically for LEP students.**

AMERICA 2000 has set five core subject areas as those to be tracked for improvement in American education. They are mathematics, science, history, English, and geography. The improvement strategy for the nation will fail if the education of LEP students fails. Consequently, we professional educators, working on programs and practices for LEP students, must develop describable and specific programs for LEP students in each of the five core subject areas.

3. **Engage selected professorial and administrative persons from teacher training institutions in a national dialogue on numbers one and two above, through a series of coordinated symposia and workshops.**

Literature searches keep the profession alert to new developments, but usually much later than would be appropriate in a fast changing environment. We need to be sponsoring and holding a series of coordinated serious symposia, workshops, and developmental strategy sessions on each of the areas identified through the activities of one and two above.

4. **Provide general seminars for all college level education professors to learn administrative and teaching knowledge specifically appropriate for their content areas for working with LEP students.**

Periodically, especially during summers and other academic slow times, national seminars and conferences should be held to challenge the profession to develop the new paradigm and outline it, and use its information and knowledge base as it emerges.

5. **Provide ongoing help, nationally, for all professorial persons to build continually the knowledge that emerges from steps one through four above into teacher training curricula as appropriate at the local level.**

A national coordinated strategy, such as a national voluntary standards development activity, should be initiated so that all those who would be affected by step numbers one through four above might participate and gain from the knowledge base as it is being set into the new paradigm.

6. **Develop strategies for measuring the inclusion into teacher training appropriate curricula for the teaching of the knowledge about LEP learning needs and strategies.**

The application of the quality sciences to education provides guidance on developing and using appropriate measuring devices for ascertaining quality both from the perspective of the supplier of the services and the recipients of them. Quality can be measured and it is up to our profession to decide what to measure, how to do it, and who does it. Total Quality Management is one of the strategies of the quality sciences.

7. Learn the empowering process at the institutional level to provide the specific training for skills and knowledge to satisfy the needs of LEP students.

Institutional change within individual higher education institutions can occur either rapidly or slowly, depending on the environment of the moment. Leaders come and go, and bring with them their own perceived priorities and take away with them some of the momentum of special areas of interest that were alive and well as long as the leader was present. But, aside from the influence of individuals, each state has regulatory and governance issues that control and balance the operations and output of IHEs. It is extremely important to know how the regulatory and governance processes work at both state and institutional levels. State offices usually address general policies and local institutions concentrate on specific programs within general policy guidelines. Professional educators seem the most vulnerable to change in personnel through changes in operations policy, while professionals, i.e., professors, are generally viewed as experts who should be on target with issues in their field. Our specific challenge is to make sure the general policies of the state and the operational institutional policies are constructed to align with the critical issues in the professional fields. I suggest to you that the educational outcomes for LEP students, all LEP students, is a critical issue in American education.

What is before us is a significant challenge -- but a challenge that is attainable. Americans have a history of meeting challenges. We can meet this one also, if we successfully collaborate in such ways so as to benefit LEP students from our cooperative synergy. We must have total quality cooperation of all education professionals who are aware of the issues involved and are totally committed to their solution. We can do it and we can do it more quickly and easily if we involve all those who would be affected by our actions at the start. Let's move it on TOGETHER so the LEP train can reach its destination.

Notes

[1] National Commission on Children, Beyond Rhetoric A New American Agenda for Children and Families: A Final Report of the National Commission on Children (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1991).

[2] International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement, The Underachieving Curriculum: Assessing U.S. School Mathematics from an International Perspective (Champaign, IL: Stipes, 1987), pp.14-29.

[3] International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement, Science Achievement in Seventeen Countries: A Preliminary Report (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1988), pp. 25-43.

[4] U.S. Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Preparing Young Children for Success: Guideposts for Achieving Our First National Goal, 1991, pp. 4-5.

[5] G. Natriello, E.L. McDill, and A.M. Pallas, Schooling Disadvantaged Children: Racing Against Catastrophe (New York: Teachers College Press, 1990), pp. 25-28.

[6] Ibid.

[7] Robert Milk, "Preparing Teachers for Effective Bilingual Instruction," in Languages in School and Society: Policy and Pedagogy, Mary E. McGroarty and Christian J. Faltis, eds. (Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1990), pp. 267-280.

[8] Milk, "Preparing Teachers for Effective Bilingual Instruction," p. 270.

[9] Milk, "Preparing Teachers for Effective Bilingual Instruction," p. 270.

[10] Milk, "Preparing Teachers for Effective Bilingual Instruction," pp. 273-274.

[11] Eleanor Thonis, "Competencies for Teachers of Language Minority Students," in Languages in School and Society: Policy and Pedagogy, Mary E. McGroarty and Christian J. Faltis, eds. (Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1990), pp. 282-283.

[12] U.S. Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Preparing Young Children for Success, p. 2.

[13] U.S. Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Preparing Young Children for Success, p. 3.

[14] U.S. Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Preparing Young Children for Success, p. 4.

[15] S. Purkey and M.S. Smith, "Effective Schools: A Review," Elementary School Journal 83(1983):427-452; J.E. Chubb and T.M. Moe, Politics, Markets, and America's Schools (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 1990), pp. 159-166.

[16] Purkey and Smith, "Effective Schools," pp. 443-446; M.S. Smith and J. O'Day, Systemic School Reform: Draft (Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University School of Education, 1990), pp. 3-5.

[17] Purkey and Smith, "Effective Schools," pp. 440-442; Smith and O'Day, Systemic School Reform, p. 4.

[18] Smith and O'Day, Systemic School Reform, p. 4; J.S. Coleman and T. Hoffer, Public and Private High Schools: The Impact of Communities (New York: Basic Books, 1987), pp. 3-27.

[19] Rosemarie V. Rosen, ". . . For the Short and Long Term . . ." Harvard Educational Review 54 (February 1984):27.

[20] Bonnie Benard, Barbara Fafoglia, and Jan Perone, "Knowing What to Do--and Not to Do--Reinvigorates Drug Education," ASCD Curriculum Update (February 1987): 2.

[21] For example, as featured in the "Excellence: School by School" issue of Educational Leadership (March 1985) and the "Partnership: Building Links Between Schools and Communities" of Phi Delta Kappan (February 1984).

[22] Beatrice A. Ward and Joseph T. Pascarelli, "Networking for Educational Improvement," in The Ecology of School Renewal, John I. Goodlad, ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987), p. 194.

[23] Richard L. Andrews, "The School-Community Interface: Strategies of Community Involvement," in The Ecology of School Renewal, John I. Goodlad, ed. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1987), p. 158.

[24] Charles D. Pauly, "Meeting Goals is Easier When Everyone Pulls in the Same Direction," The American School Board Journal (November 1987):52.

[25] R.C. Lonsdale, "Maintaining the Organization in Dynamic Equilibrium," in Behavioral Science and Educational Administration, Sixty-third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II, D. Griffiths, ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964), pp. 142-177.

[26] R. Likert, The Human Organization: Its Management and Value (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967), p. 134.

[27] A.W. Halpin, Theory and Research in Administration (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1966), p. 50.

[28] J.A. Culbertson, "The Preparation of Administrators," in Behavioral Science and Educational Administration, p. 315.

[29] R.C. Lonsdale, p. 174.

[30] P.M. Blau, "Structural Effects," American Sociological Review, Vol. 25, No. 2 (April, 1960), p. 178.

[31] R. Likert, New Patterns of Management (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1964).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

[32] R. Likert, The Human Organization, p. 47.

[33] R. Likert, New Patterns of Management, pp. 222-234.

[34] W.C. Schutz, FIRO: A Three-Dimensional Theory of Interpersonal Behavior (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1960), p. 14.

[35] K. Horney, Our Inner Conflicts (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1945), pp. 40-43.

[36] E. Fromm, Man for Himself (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1947), pp. 109-110.

[37] S. Freud, "Libidinal Types," in Collection Papers, Vol. 5 (London: Hogarth, 1950), pp. 247-248.

[38] C. Argyris, Personality and Organization (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957), pp. 33-41.

[39] A.H. Maslow, Motivation and Personality (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1954), pp. 80-92.

[40] T. Parsons, Structure and Process in Political Systems (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1960), p. 175.

References

Alatis, J., Stern, H., & Strevens, P. (Eds.). (1983). Applied linguistics and the preparation of second language teachers: Toward a rationale. Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Argyris, C. (1960). Personality and organizations. New York: Harper Brothers.

Blau, P. M. (1960). Structural effects. American Sociological Review, 25(2).

Celce-Murcia, M. (1983). Problem solving: A bridge builder between theory and practice. In J. Alatis, H. Stern, & P. Strevens (Eds.), Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics (pp. 97-105). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Clark, E., & Mike, R. (1984). Training bilingual teachers: A look at the Title VII graduate in the field. NABE Journal, 8(1), 41-53.

Collier, V. (1985). University models for ESL and bilingual teacher training. Issues in English language development (pp. 81-90). Rosslyn, VA: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Culbertson, J. A. The preparation of administrators. Behavioral Science and Educational Administration.

Freud, S. (1950). Libidinal types. In Collected Papers Vol. 5. London: Hagarth.

Fromm, E. (1947). Man for himself. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Guba, E. G. & Bidwell, C. E. Administrative relationships. (Monograph No. 4). Chicago: University of Chicago, Midwest Administration Center.

Halpin, A. W. (1966). Theory and research in administration. New York: MacMillan.

Horney, K. (1945). Our inner conflicts. New York: W. W. Norton & Co.

Likert, R. (1964). New patterns of management. New York: McGraw Hill.

Likert, R. (1967). The human organization: Its management and value. New York: McGraw Hill.

Lonsdale, R. C. (1964). Maintaining the organization in dynamic equilibrium. In Behavioral science and educational administration. Sixty-third yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part III. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Maslow, A. H. (1954). Motivation and personality. New York: Harper & Row.

McGroarty, M., & Galvin, J. (1985). Culture as an issue in second language teaching. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), Beyond basics: Issues and research in TESOL (pp. 81-95). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

McKeon, D. (1985). Some common components in training bilingual, ESL, foreign language, and mainstream teachers. Issues in English Language Development (97-106). Rosslyn, VA: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Mellgren, M., Walker, C., & Lange, D. (1988). The preparation of second language teachers through post-baccalaureate education. Foreign Language Annals, 21, 121-129.

Milk, R. (1985). The changing role of ESL in bilingual education. TESOL Quarterly, 19(4), 657-672.

Milk, R. D. (1991). Preparing teachers in effective bilingual instruction. In M. E. McGroarty & C. J. Faltis (Eds.), Languages in school and society: Policy and pedagogy. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Parsons, T. (1960). Structure and process in political systems. Glencoe: The Free Press.

Politizer, R. (1978). Some reflections on the role of linguistics in the preparation of bilingual/cross-cultural teachers. Bilingual Education Paper Series, 1(12). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 161 274)

Schutz, W. C. (1958). FIRO: A three-dimensional theory of personal behavior. New York: Holt, Reinhart, & Winston.

Soto, L. D. Understanding bilingual/bicultural young children. Young Children, 42(2), 30-36.

Thonis, E. W. (1991). Competencies for teachers of language minority students. In M. E. McGroarty & C. J. Faltis (Eds.), Language in school and society: Policy and pedagogy. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Response to John Steffens' Presentation

Virginia Collier
George Mason University, Virginia

I heartily affirm the challenge that John has presented to our field, to reach all teachers and administrators in the United States and to provide them with the appropriate training to work with the few or the many limited English proficient students that they may receive in their classrooms and schools. I would like to extend the idea to include not just limited-English-proficient students, but all language minority students. SE should be more consistent with the original Title VII Bilingual Education Act, which addressed not only students of limited English proficiency but all language minority students, knowing that all language minority students, even those who are fluent only in English, still need help.

As we language minority educators approach the challenge, I believe that the key to the most practical solution to developing a strategy for reaching all teachers and administrators is to link up with the current school reform movement taking place across the country. There are a lot of exciting things happening. Some of the major reforms taking place have to do with the administrative structure of schools, such as changes to make the decision-making process more collaborative for all participants -- including teachers, students, parents, administrators, and community. Think about what that means for language minorities; it means parent involvement in a way not possible before. Another major change in the administrative structure of schools is the movement toward eliminating tracking, which was a side effect of our efforts at compensatory education reforms of the 60s and 70s and has had disastrous effects on all minority students. Jeannie Oakes and others have spoken eloquently on this issue.

Other major changes currently taking place in schools are focused on the curriculum and methods of teaching such as: first, the development of higher order thinking skills, including hands-on experiential learning and problem solving; second, team teaching; third, the more meaningful integration of all subject areas as a result of the teaming; fourth, whole language approaches to teaching language, including teaching writing as a process and getting students to write a great deal; and fifth, the use of cooperative learning and the consequent elimination of ability grouping, another form of tracking.

Our research on language minority education to date indicates that all of these promising practices also help language minor-

ity students significantly. A monograph written by Lorraine Valdez-Pierce, Effective Schools for Language Minority Students, published by the Mid-Atlantic Equity Center in 1991, examining the school reform movement and effective strategies for language minority education that are connected to the changes now taking place in schools.

I believe that our field has made some mistakes in the past by falling into the same trap that special education got into in its early stages of development through the creation of separate programs and classrooms for the special needs of students. Over the last decade, in the 80s, special education has worked very hard to mainstream students who were formerly placed in special education classes, to find the least restrictive environments for students with special needs. This has involved some creative team teaching, getting special education teachers and mainstream teachers back together again, moving students back into integrated programs designed for all students.

We language minority educators must face the same issues. It is clear that schools by the end of this decade must eliminate tracking and ability grouping. This means a total restructuring of the secondary school. We have a long way to go on this issue. Middle schools are doing this right now; teaming is in; meaningful integration of subject matter is taking place. We language minority educators must join these reform efforts now and make sure that the decisions for new school structures reflect the needs of language minority students. The amazing thing is that many of these reform efforts do reflect best practice for the education of language minority students, but what is missing from the teacher and administrator training currently going on is a clear synthesis of the research on bilingualism and biculturalism and how a student's two languages and cultures interact with and influence the process of learning. We have to work on finding a way for mainstream administrators and teachers to get this information.

Our first step to creating a new paradigm that John recommends for teacher training might be to gather together the most meaningful syntheses of research on language minority education and make them readily available to all teacher trainers. The Center for Cultural Diversity and Second Language learning has been given the responsibility for publishing some of these syntheses. The rest of us can also be working on dissemination of research syntheses in our publications.

One possible means for dissemination of this knowledge base would be the institutes for IHE education faculty that John has proposed in his paper. This could become a trainer model and it seems very exciting. Those attending the institutes would be given procedures and ideas for retraining their own faculty when they return to their institutions. However, special education has already tried some

of these kinds of institutes with somewhat limited success. In my own experience with my colleagues in higher education, I find that it is important to find some kind of very clever institutional incentives for faculty retraining; otherwise, they will go their own independent ways and do things as they have always done them.

I would like to share with you a model that we are exploring at George Mason University. Up to this point in our teacher training program, special education faculty have trained special education teachers; bilingual education faculty have trained bilingual and ESL teachers, and mainstream faculty have trained mainstream teachers, for the most part. There is some course work which all three groups of preparing teachers attend jointly, but there are many special courses for the specialists. Yet, special education and bilingual education faculty have felt increasingly separated from mainstream faculty. While we share decisions across all education faculty, we have fallen into the same segregated institutionalization of our fields that has occurred in public schools.

We have decided that we must change this pattern. Since the school reform movement is pushing for lots of team teaching at elementary school and middle school levels, and I hope someday this will also be a teaching pattern in secondary schools, we faculty feel that we should model teaming by faculty teaming in our teacher training program. We are just beginning to explore the idea. This will involve lots more preparation time, with both faculty members attending, but all class sessions will allow faculty to learn from each other and to incorporate language minority and special education issues into all teacher training courses, in an integrated program.

As we are talking, we find that we agree on the major knowledge that we want to get across to teachers and each of us has special expertise to contribute to the courses that the other faculty respect as important for preparing teachers to know. We expect this teaming to enrich our own knowledge and skills. We are thinking that the curricular and instructional reform now taking place in many schools will become the cornerstone of our teacher training program: teaching higher order thinking skills, experiential/interactive learning, whole language approaches, integration of language and content across the curriculum, use of cooperative learning and elimination of tracking and ability grouping, and, added to that, understanding bilingualism and multiculturalism and all of the dynamic aspects of linguistic and cultural process taking place inside and outside the classroom. A quote from Lorraine Valdez-Pierce's book provides an example of training strategies needed in our teaming: "Recent research suggests that transmission models of education are not effective with minority students who are at-risk of failure in schools....For these students, reciprocal interaction models based on student collaboration have been shown to be more effective....These define the

teacher's role as that of a facilitator, one who makes things happen by providing a learning environment which promotes student interaction and efficient questioning strategies necessary to the development of higher order skills" (Valdez-Pierce, 1991, p. 20).

Perhaps this is just one way of initiating development of a new paradigm. I know there are others. In some states the pressure of student demographic changes, with increasing language minority needs, will force teacher training faculty to seek change. A major change agent can be changes in certification standards for mainstream teachers, which Rosita will address next, explaining changes taking place in California.

I would like to finish my comments by addressing the issue of the training of bilingual and ESL teachers more specifically. As we watch and join these reform movements for all education, we must speak out to clarify that language minority education should not follow the outdated notions of compensatory and remedial education. Basic skills approaches are a sure way to keep our students at the bottom of the success ladder. We must demand high quality training for bilingual and ESL teachers, integrated with mainstream teachers, that keeps up with the latest research on what works with all students. Bilingual students want to be active learners; they want to have access to all the advantages provided for gifted and talented learners.

As we look at ways to integrate all learners into meaningful classes, we must continue to expand ways for providing support for language minority students' cognitive development in their first language. Research clearly shows that first language cognitive development is crucial to second language academic achievement. There are many meaningful ways to support the first language, through the school environment and attitudes toward the first language, through family education in the school evenings and weekends, through encouragement of parents' first language activities with children at home, and (the best of all possible worlds from my point of view) through two-way bilingual programs where English speakers respect and share in the process of learning a second language.

We cannot implement two-way bilingual schools everywhere, but even in neighborhoods where there are just a few limited-English-proficient students, when English speaking parents want their children to learn the first language of those limited-English proficient students, a two-way program can be perceived by all as a gifted and talented class with the highest expectations for success. I'm currently watching the changes that are taking place in parent attitudes occurring in Fairfax County Public Schools here in our metropolitan area, where the eight bilingual schools now in their third year of implementation have incredible parent support, with many other

parents clamoring for similar programs in their schools. There are only a few language minority students in these classes because there are just a few in each of these schools. Those language minority students are benefitting enormously from the prestige suddenly given to their language and the pride and self-esteem they feel. They are doing very well academically along with their English-speaking peers.

One more example is my daughter's own two-way bilingual school in the District of Columbia Public Schools. I conducted a small case study a couple of years ago, contacting all the Hispanic and Anglo graduates that I could locate from the first year of implementation of the program in 1971. All 20 that I found are now college graduates who have continued full use of their two languages in their careers. They are very successful professionals, and the most amazing thing is that many of the Anglo as well as Hispanic students have chosen social service professions including teaching (some of them are bilingual teachers), and they are assisting language minority communities with successful achievement and upward mobility. I hope we can keep this in mind as an ideal vision of integrated, exciting schooling for the future of all our students.

Response to John Steffens' Presentation

Rosita G. Galang
University of San Franciso

In the last two years, in light of the demographic changes in the California school-age population, the Bilingual Cross Cultural Advisory Panel of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) has been engaged in the re-examination of the existing preparation programs, credentials, certificates, and examinations for teachers of students from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds. As a member of this panel and as a faculty in an Institute of Higher Education (IHE) involved in the preparation of teachers in a state where there were more than 860,000 identified "limited English proficient" (LEP) students representing 137 languages in the 1989-90 school year, I am deeply interested in the topic of today's session. Therefore, I am grateful to OBEMLA for giving me the opportunity to learn from the session this afternoon and also to share my thoughts and those of my colleagues on the panel regarding the preparation of teachers of LEP students.

As some presenters in an earlier session and the participants in last year's symposium have pointed out, the term LEP is not acceptable to many who regard it as demeaning, derogatory, and/or focusing on students' limitations rather than potential. Although I would much rather use a different term such as beginning English learners or potentially English proficient students, I will use the term LEP since it's the term used in this symposium and the paper to which I have been invited to respond.

As a discussant with only twenty minutes to respond to the paper, I will limit my comments to these areas: the need for a paradigm shift, a suggested paradigm for the preparation of teachers, and steps that could be taken to accomplish the said paradigm shift.

Specifically, my response aims to do the following:

1. Point out selected assumptions and concepts presented by the author that I generally agree with and therefore form the bases of my comments.

2. Present some of my reflections regarding the preparation program described in the paper.

3. Suggest a paradigm with the potential of meeting the need for trained teachers of LEP students.

4. Give some reflections on the steps that might be taken to accomplish the paradigm shift.

Need for a Paradigm Shift

From the assumptions and concepts presented in the paper, I have selected a few as bases of my brief response. These are:

1. That language minority children, many of whom are identified as limited English proficient, make up a growing proportion of our student population and their rapid increase in number is expected to continue. In fact, in California, their rate of increase and extent of diversity have grown in recent years.

2. That current LEP students are not concentrated in any one location but, instead, reside in three types of communities and consequently study in three types of classrooms.

   Type A -- where there are significant numbers of LEP students of similar ethnolinguistic backgrounds

   Type B -- where there are significant numbers of LEP students of different ethnolinguistic backgrounds

   Type C -- where there are small groups of LEP students of different ethnolinguistic backgrounds and are sparsely distributed so that only one or a few might be found in the classrooms

3. That it is our responsibility to provide equal educational opportunities for all LEP students, even if there's only one or two in the classroom.

4. That we haven't been able to supply enough bilingual teachers to teach in classrooms where there are concentrations of LEP students of similar or different ethnolinguistic backgrounds (Type A and B classrooms).

   Corollary to this assumption is the need to continue the training of bilingual teachers. The number of teachers who have the necessary instructional, linguistic, and cultural competencies have not kept pace with the continued growth and diversity of the language minority student population.

5. That we have not paid attention to and therefore need to look at the LEP students sparsely distributed in classrooms (Type C).

6. That we need a paradigm shift in the preparation of teachers of LEP students.

Building a New Paradigm

While the change in the preparation program described or implied in the paper is a commendable attempt to respond to the demand for teachers of LEP students, it can only be considered as a short-term solution to the shortage of the needed teachers. I should point out that its focus on what all teachers need to know and be able to do when a few LEP students are assigned to their classrooms is a step in the right direction. However, its lack of connection or statement of connection to the preparation of English as a Second Language (ESL) and bilingual teachers makes it an inadequate change. At best, the products of such a program are prepared to teach in Type C classrooms--those with LEP students who are sparsely distributed. It cannot account for the preparation of teachers needed in Types A and B classrooms.

Historically, the preparation of ESL, bilingual, and the so-called "regular" teachers have been designed and implemented separately and independently of each other in response to specific needs at particular times. Perhaps our inability to meet the demand for teachers that could function in the three types of classrooms can partly be attributed to this unfortunate situation. The author points out that we need a new paradigm in the preparation of teachers of LEP students. I agree, and I strongly believe that we need a paradigm that relates the preparation of teachers in a comprehensive system for LEP students.

Prerequisite to the conceptualization of such a paradigm is the examination of the instructional needs of LEP students whether they are in Classroom A, B, or C. LEP students, like all students, need opportunities to learn the core curriculum. Traditional or mainstream instruction in English denies them access to the core curriculum. Therefore, their basic instructional needs are English language development and access to the core curriculum. English language development involves ESL instructional methodologies and access to the curriculum involves academic instruction in the primary language and specially designed academic instruction in English. Specially designed academic instruction in English may be defined as the teaching of the content of the core curriculum in English to LEP students in a way that considers their level of English proficiency, for example, through sheltered English subject matter instruction. Here the teacher utilizes instructional modifications such as simplified speech, and the use of verbal clues to make the language comprehensible to the students. This type of instruction is used where primary language instruction is not possible or available.

The instructional needs of LEP students can be met by using a bilingual teacher or a team of teachers who can provide ESL instruction and bilingual instruction (Primary Language and English in-

struction). Unfortunately, these are not always feasible, practical or advisable for several reasons. The continuing shortage of bilingual teachers and the increasing linguistic and cultural diversity of our student population emphasize the need for teachers who are prepared to provide English language development instruction and equal access to the core curriculum. Where primary language instruction is not a viable option, specially designed academic instruction in English is accepted as an alternative.

In Type A classrooms, ESL instruction and primary language instruction can be provided by bilingual teachers.

In Type B classrooms, ESL instruction and specially designed academic instruction in English can be provided by a Language Development Specialist.

In Type C classrooms, instruction in English can be provided by "regular" teachers who have been trained in multicultural education.

The paper focuses on what all teachers need to know and be able to do when LEP students are assigned to their classrooms, specifically in small numbers. The preliminary list of content areas cited in the paper could serve as core training areas for all teachers, bilingual or non-bilingual, and may be considered as the first level or component of the new paradigm. Teachers prepared in these content areas, usually called "regular" teachers, may serve in Type C classrooms. The second level may include the said core training plus training in ESL instruction and specially designed academic instruction in English. Teachers prepared by such a program, identified as Language Development Specialists (LDS) (for lack of a better term), may be assigned to Type B classrooms. The third level may include the same core training, training in ESL and specially designed academic instruction in English, and the following: development of proficiency in the student's primary language, increased knowledge of the student's background culture, and skills in teaching the primary language and using it as a medium of instruction. Teachers prepared by this program, known as bilingual teachers, may be assigned to Type A classrooms. It should be pointed out that depending on the needs of the students, the bilingual teachers are also prepared to teach in all types of classrooms while the LDS are also prepared to teach in Type C classrooms.

In California, the Commission on Teaching Credentialing Standards for Teacher Preparation Programs have already been revised to include multicultural education and second language acquisition as part of the preparation of all Multiple Subjects (Elementary) and Single Subject (Secondary) teachers. Still, the standards are being reexamined to further strengthen or increase the emphasis in the

two areas. These are the "regular" teachers who serve in Type C classrooms.

Just last August, the conceptual framework proposed by the CTC Bilingual Cross-Cultural Advisory Panel was accepted by the Commission. The said framework exemplifies the paradigm that I have just described.

Matching the types of instruction needed in classrooms with significant numbers of LEP students (Type A and B classrooms), three types of credential/preparation programs/examinations are included in the framework:

1. Multiple Subjects/Single Subject Credential with a Cross-Cultural Language and Academic Development Emphasis (CLAD) which, in addition to the core training for "regular teachers" includes training in these areas:

   a. Language Structure, Acquisition and Development
   b. Bilingual and ESL Models and Methodology
   c. "Generic" Culture or Cross-Cultural Communication

2. Multiple Subjects/Single Subject Credential with a Bilingual Cross-Cultural Language and Academic Development Emphasis (BCLAD) includes the training for the "regular teachers," the training for the CLAD teachers, and preparation in three additional areas:

   a. Methodology for Instruction in the Language of Emphasis
   b. The Culture of Emphasis
   c. The Language of Emphasis

3. Culture and Language Specialist Credential includes preparation for the CLAD Credential holder plus further preparation on

   a. Assessment
   b. Curriculum Development
   c. Staff Training
   d. Community/Parent Relations

4. Bilingual Culture and Language Specialist Credential includes preparation for the BCLAD credential holder plus further preparation on the same areas cited in 3.

The California theoretical framework relates the preparation for teachers of LEP students to the instructional needs of LEP students in the three types of classrooms described earlier.

All teachers (including the "regular teachers") will be able to provide instruction in Type C classrooms since everyone will have the "core training" needed to be prepared to deal with one or a few LEP students.

CLAD teachers will also be able to provide instruction in Type B classrooms where significant numbers of LEP students of different ethnolinguistic backgrounds will receive instruction in ESL and specially designed academic instruction in English.

BCLAD teachers will be able to provide instruction in Type A classrooms where there are significant members of LEP students of similar ethnolinguistic backgrounds and therefore will receive instruction in and through the primary language, specially designed academic instruction in English, and instruction in ESL.

The Culture and Language Specialists will provide the leadership and resources needed by CLAD and BCLAD teachers.

The paradigm which I have described appears to be relevant and has the potential of being used as a guide in designing preparation programs for teachers of LEP students.

1) It provides a framework for the training of teachers who can serve in the three types of classrooms.

2) It shows the common areas shared by the preparation of the different teachers and the additional areas of training for the same.

3) It presents teachers with options for obtaining training in teaching LEP students depending on their goals and qualifications. For example, the monolingual English or "regular" teacher might start with the preparation for Type B classrooms and ultimately strive for the preparation for Type A classrooms.

4) It provides opportunities for integrating areas of bilingual education and ESL and content area instruction and therefore encourages collaboration among bilingual and non-bilingual teachers and their trainers.

Implementing the Paradigm Shift

In the last section of the paper, steps that need to be taken to accomplish the paradigm shift are listed and discussed briefly. Allow me to give my reflections on two of them.

Engage selected professorial and administrative persons from teacher training institutions in a national dialogue through a series of coordinated symposia and workshops.

While a national dialogue among professorial and administrative persons from teacher training institutions is needed, collaboration needs to be expanded. The value of collaboration in teacher education in general and language minority teacher education in particular cannot be overemphasized. Collaboration is critical at different levels and among everyone involved in and affected by the process--teachers, students, administrators, teacher trainers, and others. As Emily DiMartino wrote in Education in 1991, collaboration is a vertical phenomenon as elementary school children and teachers interact with personnel at the university level and horizontal as liberal arts and education faculty within the college work together to strengthen the training of prospective teachers. Collaboration should be an ongoing process during the planning, designing, implementing, evaluating, and reviewing or modifying steps.

Learn the empowering process at the institutional level to provide the specific training for skills and knowledge to satisfy the needs of LEP students.

I suggest that we also look at the empowering process in a light different from that discussed in the paper. In an article that appeared in the Harvard Educational Review in 1986, Alma Ada underscored that for teachers to be able to provide creative education for language minority students, they themselves need to experience the liberating forces of this type of education.

Teachers have to be empowered through an understanding of the societal forces that have influenced their linguistic and cultural identity so that they cease being passive and, instead, become pro-active in transforming their own selves and assuming a leadership role in the world around them. Through empowerment of teachers, we may expect empowerment of students. If successful programs for language minority students are those that empower students, that is, develop in them a strong sense of confidence in who they are and their ability to learn, then the empowering process should be an important component of the paradigm that will be used as a guide for designing preparation programs for teachers of LEP students.

Conclusion

The paradigm that I have just described was presented in response to the challenge posed in the paper regarding the need for a paradigm shift. The paradigm is by no means final and therefore may be modified as societal changes that affect education occur. Fur-

thermore, it is not meant to dictate what teacher training should be but, instead, to guide the design of teacher preparation programs.

As we collaboratively build a paradigm that is responsive to the demand for teachers of LEP students, let's keep in mind that our ultimate goal is to prepare teachers who can provide equal and quality educational opportunities for linguistically and culturally different students.